REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-16, which were all of the then pending claims, under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,199,077 (Inala, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication no. 2002/0049833 (Kikinis).

Independent Claims 1, 6 and 10 are being amended to better define the subject matters of these claims. Claim 14 is being amended to elaborate on the feature described in the claim, and new Claim 17, which is dependent from Claim 5, is being added to describe a preferred feature of the present invention. Editorial changes are being made to Claims 15 and 16, and Claim 4 is being cancelled to reduce the number of issues in this case.

For the reasons set forth below, Claims 1-3 and 5-17 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-3 and 5-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and to allow these claims and new Claim 17.

The present invention, generally, relates to a method and system for processing text files in computer applications. In accordance with the instant invention, a plurality of templates is formed having literal fragments of the text file, and a micro class is provided to map data from the text file to the computer application. A pointer to the macro class is embedded in the template. The template is used as an overlay to parse the text file into segments having data, or as a prototype to generate a segment of an output file. During this use, when the pointer in the template is reached, that pointer is used to invoke the macro class and the macro class is used to map data from one of the segments of the text file to the computer application. The macro class then invokes another template to further process the text file.

PAGE 13/17 * RCVD AT 9/29/2005 2:19:33 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/29 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:5167424366 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-38

The references of record, including Inala, et al. and Kikinis, do not disclose or suggest the way in which the template and the macros cooperate together to process the text file. In particular, the prior art does not teach the nested, cooperative relationship of the templates and the macros – that is, a template calls a macro, and then that macro calls another template, which may be used to call another macro, which may call still another template, and so on.

For instance, Inala, et al. discloses a procedure and system for summarizing information retrieved over the Internet. The Examiner specifically cited columns 11-14 of Inala, et al. in support of the rejection. This portion of Inala, et al. does mention templates and scripts. However, the description of the structure of the templates is not very specific and it appears that these templates are not fragments of text from a text file. For example, the description of a template found in Inala beginning at column 11, line 45 indicates that it is made up of location and label descriptions.

This clearly suggests that these templates are not fragments of literal text from a text file. Since the templates are outputs of scripting module (see column 12, lines 35-40), it would appear that these templates are prototypes of scripts. Therefore, what is disclosed in Inala is very different from the present invention. The present invention, in contrast, processes text files used to communicate between applications or between an application and an end user.

In the Office Action, the Examiner argued that, in the method disclosed in Inala, et al, a pointer in the template is used to call a macro. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The particular portion of Inala, et al. cited by the Examiner doe not appear to describe specifically how any macro is called, but clearly it is not called via a pointer in the template.

PAGE 14/17 * RCVD AT 9/29/2005 2:19:33 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/29 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:5167424366 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-38

It is believed that the Examiner has recognized the deficiencies of Inala, et al. as a reference, and thus relies on Kikinis to overcome these deficiencies.

Kikinis discloses a data transmission protocol. Kikinis, in paragraphs 13 and 14 refers to "creating a list of parameters" and "storing the parameters as a template" (in paragraph 13) and then (in paragraph 14), "The template comprises one or more parameters derived from the characteristics of the client device." It is apparent to those of ordinary skill in the art that what is being descried here is very different from the templates used in the present invention. The templates of the present invention comprise text fragment with places to "fill in the blanks," and which include pointers to processing macros. Kikinis is not describing anything like this.

It is noted that Kikinis refers to "script. Presumably, however, the references to a script in Kikinis (paragraphs 17-22), are references to a "Mark-Script." The only similarity between this feature of Kikinis and the present invention is that both have some means to invoke computer processing. Because, as discussed above, the templates disclosed in Kikinis are not the same as the templates of the present invention, then there is no possibility that an interaction with the templates of Kikinis via a script could be the same as the interaction of templates and macros that happens in the present invention.

The Examiner, in the Office Action, argued that Kikinis discloses a method in which a number of templates may be used, and hence that it would have been obvious in view of Kikinis to modify Inala, et al. to provide a method in which a macro derives a template name from the invoking template in order to invoke the next template. Applicant respectfully submits that this conclusion does not follow from the premise. The mere fact that macros are

PAGE 15/17 * RCVD AT 9/29/2005 2:19:33 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/29 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:5167424366 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-38

used, as in Kikinis, does not teach the specific way in which the macros are used, in the present invention, to invoke further templates.

Claims 1, 6 and 10 are being amended to describe more positively the above-discussed feature of the invention. In particular, each of these claims now describes the feature that a plurality of templates are formed, and that during processing of the text file by one of the templates, a pointer in that template is used to invoke the macro class. This macro class maps data from the text file to the computer application, and then is used to invoke another one of the templates to further process the text file. The way in which the first template invokes a macro which then invokes a second template is not shown in or suggested by either Inala, et al or Kikinis, or the combination of these two references.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and they too, whether they are considered individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest using a template/macro class combination in the manner described in Claims 1, 6 and 10.

In light of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 6 and 10 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, these claims 1, 6 and 10 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2, 3, 5, 14 and 17 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 1. Also, Claims 7-9 and 15 are dependent from Claim 6 and are allowable therewith, and Claims 11-13 and 16 are dependent from Claim 10 and are allowable therewith. The Examiner is, accordingly, requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-3 and 5-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and to allow these claims and new Claim 17.

PAGE 16/17 * RCVD AT 9/29/2005 2:19:33 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/29 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:5167424366 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-38

Every effort has been made to place this application in condition for allowance, a notice of which is requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny

John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicant

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy

PAGE 17/17 * RCVD AT 9/29/2005 2:19:33 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/29 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:5167424366 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-38